

REMARKS

Reconsideration and removal of the grounds for rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 1-20 were in the application, claims 1-20 have been cancelled, without prejudice, and new claims 21-38 substituted therefore.

Claim 1-20 were rejected as being anticipated by Fulton et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,182,052.

Under 35 U.S.C. §102, anticipation requires that each and every element of the claimed invention be disclosed in a single prior art reference. W.L. Gore & Assocs., Inc v. Garlock, Inc., 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983). All the limitations in the claims must be found in the reference, since the claims measure the invention. In re Lange, 209 USPQ 288, 293 (CCPA 1981). Further, the reference must describe the applicants' claimed invention sufficiently to have placed a person of ordinary skill in the art in possession of the invention. In re Spada, 15 USPQ 2d 1655 (Fed. Cir. 1990). The Federal Circuit has stated that "even if the claimed invention is disclosed in a printed publication, that disclosure will not suffice as prior art if it is not enabling." In re Donohue, 766 F.2d 531, 533 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citing In re Borst, 345 F.2d 851,855 (C.C.P.A. 1965), cert denied, 382 U.S. 973 (1966), Seymour v. Osborne, 78 U.S. (11 Wall.) 516,555 (1870) (publication constitutes anticipation only if it enables one skilled in the art "to understand the nature and the operation of the invention, and to carry it into practical use").

The applicant's invention is directed to an electronic room space, best described and visualized with reference to applicant's Fig. 2. It is an important characteristics of the invention, that a user be able to create an electronic space represented as a "room" image, and appearing as a room to the user on a display device. This is not a conventional computer user interface, or desktop representation, as the space is configured by the user as an room containing personalized images representative of the tastes of the user, while also containing configured links to selected

resources needed for effective and efficient problem solving.

The use of the room imaging and customized selection of user resources provides a unique workplace for the user, as it provides a comfortable yet stimulating environment for tackling problems.(p. 9, l. 20-21). The personalization has many benefits, such as improving morale, stimulating interaction between users, while increasing productivity by providing access to resources dedicated to stimulating, testing and analyzing solutions. (P. 11, l. 15-21)

The examiner has cited Fulton as anticipating the applicants' invention. However, Fulton fails to disclose a computer generated electronic space represented as a room image, corresponding to the applicant's invention, best seen in Fig. 2.

Rather, Fulton refers to a terminal 11, shown in fig. 1a as a telephone with indicator buttons. This in no way corresponds to the applicant's invention, as this only represents a one dimensional user-to-system exchange.

Figs. 2-13 of Fulton show a typical sequence of displays for a user related to banking transactions. Figs. 14-16 illustrate the one dimensional structure of the system, terminal to processing center.

On the other hand, the applicant's invention, as illustrated in Fig. 3, shows the multidimensional interaction of the applicant's invention. A user having configured a virtual room with selected "decorations" and "furnishings", can work within the "room" on problem solving, in particular where a group of users, each having a room, can interact not only with these resources but also with each other in a common electronic space or "meeting room". Thus, the user works within the space, the space being a dynamic environment for the user, and not merely a one dimensional man-machine interface.

There is no disclosure of such an electronic space represented as a room image anywhere

in Fulton. Further, Fulton is non-enabling as there is no discussion of how one would or could arrive at the applicant's invention.

Each independent claim, now claims 1, 26, 32 and 38, contains specific limitations related to display of the room image, consequently these claims and the claims dependent therefrom are not anticipate by Fulton. Consequently, new claims 21-38 are not anticipated thereby.

Based on the above amendments and remarks, favorable consideration and allowance of the application is requested. However should the examiner believe that direct contact with the applicant's attorney would advance the prosecution of the application, the examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



William J. Sapone  
Registration No. 32,518  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Coleman Sudol Sapone P.C.  
714 Colorado Avenue  
Bridgeport, CT 06605  
Telephone No. (203) 366-3560  
Facsimile No. (203) 335-6779